



The Text and Cultural Politics

Author(s): Michael W. Apple

Source: *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 21, No. 7 (Oct., 1992), pp. 4-11+19

Published by: [American Educational Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1176356>

Accessed: 14/08/2013 11:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Educational Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Educational Researcher*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Text and Cultural Politics

MICHAEL W. APPLE

The school curriculum is not neutral knowledge. Rather, what counts as legitimate knowledge is the result of complex power relations, struggles, and compromises among identifiable class, race, gender, and religious groups. A good deal of conceptual and empirical progress has been made in the last 2 decades in answering the question of whose knowledge becomes socially legitimate in schools. Yet, little attention has actually been paid to that one artifact that plays such a major role in defining whose culture is taught—the textbook. In this article, I discuss ways of approaching texts as embodiments of a larger process of cultural politics. Analyses of them must focus on the complex power relationships involved in their production, contexts, use, and reading. I caution us against employing overly reductive kinds of perspectives and point to the importance of newer forms of textual analysis that stress the politics of how students actually create meanings around texts. Finally, I point to some of the implications of all this for our discussions of curriculum policy.

Reality doesn't stalk around with a label. What something is, what it does, one's evaluation of it, all this is not naturally preordained. It is socially constructed. This is the case even when we talk about the institutions that organize a good deal of our lives. Take schools, for example. For some groups of people, schooling is seen as a vast engine of democracy—opening horizons, ensuring mobility, and so on. For others, the reality of schooling is strikingly different. It is seen as a form of social control or, perhaps, as the embodiment of cultural dangers, institutions whose curricula and teaching practices threaten the moral universe of the students who attend them.

While not all of us may agree with the latter diagnosis of what schools do, this position contains a very important insight. It recognizes that behind Spencer's famous question about "What knowledge is of most worth?" there lies another, even more contentious question, "Whose knowledge is of most worth?"

During the past 2 decades, a good deal of progress has been made on answering the question of whose knowledge becomes socially legitimate in schools (see, e.g., Apple, in press; Apple & Weis, 1983). While much still remains to be understood, we are now much closer to having an adequate understanding of the relationship between school knowledge and the larger society than before. Yet little attention has actually been paid to that one artifact that plays such a major role in defining whose culture is taught—the textbook. Of course, there have been literally thousands of studies of textbooks over the years.¹ But by and large, until relatively recently, most of these remained unconcerned with the politics of culture. All too many researchers could still be

characterized by the phrase coined years ago by C. Wright Mills, "abstract empiricists." These "hunters and gatherers of social numbers" remain unconnected to the relations of inequality that surround them (Inglis, 1988, p. 9).

This is a distinct problem since texts are not simply "delivery systems" of "facts." They are the simultaneous results of political, economic, and cultural activities, battles, and compromises. They are conceived, designed, and authored by real people with real interests. They are published within the political and economic constraints of markets, resources, and power (Luke, 1988, pp. 27–29). And what texts mean and how they are used are fought over by communities with distinctly different commitments and by teachers and students as well.

In this article, I shall discuss ways of approaching textbooks that illuminate these power relations. In the process, I shall caution us against employing overly reductive kinds of perspectives and shall point to the importance of newer forms of textual analysis that stress the politics of how students actually create meanings around texts. Finally, I shall point to some of the implications of this for our discussions of curriculum policy.

The Politics of Official Knowledge

As I have argued in a series of volumes, it is naive to think of the school curriculum as neutral knowledge (Apple, 1985, 1988b, 1990). Rather, what counts as legitimate knowledge is the result of complex power relations and struggles among identifiable class, race, gender, and religious groups. Thus, education and power are terms of an indissoluble couplet. It is during times of social upheaval that this relationship between education and power becomes most visible. Such a relationship was and continues to be made manifest in the struggles by women, people of color, and others to have their history and knowledge included in the curriculum. Driven by an economic crisis and a crisis in ideology and authority relations, this relationship has become even more visible in the past decade or so in the resurgent conservative attacks on schooling. "Authoritarian populism" is in the air, and the New Right has been more than a little successful in bringing its own power to bear on the goals, content, and process of schooling (Apple, 1988a).

The movement to the right has not stopped outside the

MICHAEL W. APPLE is John Bascom Professor of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, 225 North Mills St., University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706. He specializes in curriculum studies and the sociology of education.

schoolroom door. Current plans for the centralization of authority over teaching and curriculum, often cleverly disguised as “democratic” reforms, are hardly off the drawing board before new management proposals or privatization initiatives are introduced. In the United States, evidence for such offensives abounds with the introduction of mandatory competency testing for students and teachers, the calls for a return to a (romanticized) common curriculum, the reduction of educational goals to the goals of primarily business and industry, the proposals for voucher or “choice” plans, the pressure to legislate morality and values from the right, and the introduction of state-mandated content on “free enterprise” and the like. Similar tendencies are more than a little evident in Britain and in some cases are even more advanced.

All of this has brought about countervailing movements in the schools. The slower but still interesting growth of more democratically run schools, of practices and policies that give community groups and teachers considerably more authority in text selection and curriculum determination, in teaching strategy, in the use of funds, in administration, and in developing more flexible and less authoritarian evaluation schemes is providing some cause for optimism in the midst of the conservative restoration (Bastian, Fruchter, Gittel, Greer, & Haskins, 1986).

Even with these positive signs, however, it is clear that the New Right has been able to rearticulate traditional political and cultural themes. In so doing, it has often effectively mobilized a mass base of adherents. Among its most powerful causes and effects has been the growing feeling of disaffection about public schooling among conservative groups. Large numbers of parents and other people no longer trust either the institutions or the teachers and administrators in them to make “correct” decisions about what should be taught and how to teach it. The rapid growth of evangelical schooling, of censorship, of textbook controversies, and the emerging tendency of many parents to teach their children at home rather than send them to state-supported schools are clear indications of this loss of legitimacy (see, e.g., Rose, 1988).

The ideology that stands behind this is often very complex. It combines a commitment to both the “traditional family” and clear gender roles with the commitment to “traditional values” and literal religiosity. Also often packed into this is a defense of capitalist economics, patriotism, the “western tradition,” anticommunism, and a deep mistrust of the “welfare state” (Hunter, 1988). When this ideology is applied to schooling, the result can be as simple as dissatisfaction with an occasional book or assignment. On the other hand, the result can be a major conflict that threatens to go well beyond the boundaries of our usual debates about schooling.

Few places in the United States are more well known in this latter context than Kanawha County, West Virginia. In the mid-seventies, it became the scene of one of the most explosive controversies over what schools should teach, who should decide, and what beliefs should guide our educational programs. What began as a protest by a small group of conservative parents, religious leaders, and business people over the content and design of the textbooks that had been approved for use in local schools soon spread to include school boycotts, violence, and a wrenching split within the community that in many ways has yet to heal (Moffett, 1988).

Though perhaps less violent, many similar situations have

occurred since then in a number of districts throughout the country. For instance, the recent experiences in Yucaipa, California—where the school system and largely conservative and fundamentalist protesters have been locked in what at times seemed to be nearly an explosive situation—documents the continuing conflict over what schools are for and whose values should be embodied in them. Here, too, parents and community members have raised serious challenges over texts and over cultural authority, including attacks on the material for witchcraft and occultism, a lack of patriotism, and the destruction of sacred knowledge and authority.

It is important to realize, then, that controversies over “official knowledge” that usually center around what is included and excluded in textbooks really signify more profound political, economic, and cultural relations and histories. Conflicts over texts are often proxies for wider questions of power relations. They involve what people hold most dear. And, as in the case of Kanawha County and Yucaipa, they can quickly escalate into conflicts over these deeper issues.

Yet textbooks are surely important in and of themselves. They signify—through their content *and* form—particular constructions of reality, particular ways of selecting and organizing that vast universe of possible knowledge. They embody what Raymond Williams called the *selective tradition*—someone’s selection, someone’s vision of legitimate knowledge and culture, one that in the process of enfranchising one group’s cultural capital disenfranchises another’s (Williams, 1961; see also Apple, 1990).

Texts are really messages to and about the future. As part of a curriculum, they participate in no less than the organized knowledge system of society. They participate in creating what a society has recognized as legitimate and truthful. They help set the canons of truthfulness and, in that way, also help recreate a major reference point for what knowledge, culture, belief, and morality really are (Inglis, 1985, pp. 22–23).

Yet such a statement—even with its recognition that texts participate in constructing ideologies and ontologies—is basically misleading in many important ways. For it is not a “society” that has created such texts, but specific groups of people. “We” haven’t built such curriculum artifacts in the simple sense that there is universal agreement among all of us and this is what gets to be official knowledge. In fact, the very use of the pronoun “we” simplifies matters all too much.

As Fred Inglis (1985) so cogently argues, the pronoun *we*:

smooths over the deep corrugations and ruptures caused precisely by struggle over how that authoritative and editorial “we” is going to be used. The [text], it is not melodramatic to declare, really is the battleground for an intellectual civil war, and the battle for cultural authority is a wayward, intermittingly fierce, always protracted and fervent one. (p. 23)

Let me give one example. In the 1930s, conservative groups in the United States mounted a campaign against one of the more progressive textbook series in use in schools. *Man and His Changing World* by Harold Rugg (Rugg, 1938) and his colleagues became the subject of a concerted attack by the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Legion, The Advertising Federation of America, and other “neutral” groups. They charged that Rugg’s books were

socialist, anti-American, anti-business, and so forth. The conservative campaign was more than a little successful in forcing school districts to withdraw Rugg's series from classrooms and libraries. So successful were they that sales fell from nearly 300,000 copies in 1938 to only approximately 20,000 in 1944 (Schipper, 1983).

We, of course, may have reservations about such texts today, not least of which would be the sexist title. But one thing that the Rugg case makes clear is that the politics of the textbook is not something new by any means. Current issues surrounding texts—their ideology, their very status as central definers of what we should teach, even their very effectiveness and their design—echo the past moments of these concerns that have had such a long history in so many countries.

Few aspects of schooling are currently subject to more intense scrutiny and criticism than the text. Perhaps one of the most graphic descriptions is provided by A. Graham Down of the Council for Basic Education:

Textbooks, for better or worse, dominate what students learn. They set the curriculum, and often the facts learned, in most subjects. For many students, textbooks are their first and sometimes only early exposure to books and to reading. The public regards textbooks as authoritative, accurate, and necessary. And teachers rely on them to organize lessons and structure subject matter. But the current system of textbook adoption has filled our schools with Trojan horses—glossily covered blocks of paper whose words emerge to deaden the minds of our nation's youth, and make them enemies of learning. (A. Graham Down in Tyson-Bernstein, p. viii)

This statement is made just as powerfully by the author of a recent study of what she has called "America's textbook fiasco."

Imagine a public policy system that is perfectly designed to produce textbooks that confuse, mislead, and profoundly bore students, while at the same time making all of the adults involved in the process look good, not only in their own eyes, but in the eyes of others. Although there are some good textbooks on the market, publishers and editors are virtually compelled by public policies and practices to create textbooks that confuse students with non sequiturs, that mislead them with misinformation, and that profoundly bore them with pointlessly arid writing. (Tyson-Bernstein, 1988, p. 3).

Regulation or Liberation and the Text

In order to understand these criticisms and to understand both some of the reasons why texts look the way they do and why they contain some groups' perspectives and not others', we also need to realize that the world of the book has not been cut off from the world of commerce. Books are not only cultural artifacts, they are economic commodities as well. Even though texts may be vehicles of ideas, they still have to be "peddled on a market" (Darnton, 1982, p. 199). This is a market, however, that—especially in the national and international world of textbook publishing—is politically volatile, as the Kanawha County experience so clearly documented.

Texts are caught up in a complicated set of political and economic dynamics. Text publishing often is highly competitive. In the United States, where text production is a com-

mercial enterprise situated within the vicissitudes of a capitalist market, decisions about the "bottom line" determine what books are published and for how long. Yet this situation is not just controlled by the "invisible hand" of the market. It is also largely determined by the highly visible "political hand" of state textbook-adoption policies.²

Nearly half of the states—most of them in the southern tier and the "sun belt"—have state textbook-adoption committees that by and large choose what texts will be purchased by the schools in that state. The economics of profit and loss of this situation make it imperative that publishers devote nearly all of their efforts to guaranteeing a place on these lists of approved texts. Because of this, the texts made available to the entire nation, and the knowledge considered legitimate in them, are determined by what will sell in Texas, California, Florida, and other large textbook-adoption states. There can be no doubt that the political and ideological controversies over content in these states, controversies that were often very similar to those that surfaced in Kanawha County and Yucaipa, have had a very real impact on what and whose knowledge is made available. It is also clear that Kanawha County and Yucaipa were affected by and had an impact on these larger battles over legitimate knowledge.

Economic and political realities structure text publishing not only internally, however. On an international level, the major text-publishing conglomerates control the market of much of the material not only in the capitalist centers but in many other nations as well. Cultural domination is a fact of life for millions of students throughout the world, in part because of the economic control of communication and publishing by multinational firms, in part because of the ideologies and systems of political and cultural control of new elites within former colonial countries.³ All of this, too, has led to complicated relations and struggles over official knowledge and the text between "center" and "periphery" and within these areas as well.

I want to stress that all of this is not simply—as in the case of newly emerging nations, Kanawha County, or the Rugg textbooks—of historical interest. As I noted, the controversies over the form and content of the textbook have not diminished. In fact, they have become even more heated, in the United States in particular. The changing ideological climate has had a major impact on debates over what should be taught in schools and on how it should be taught and evaluated. There is considerable pressure to raise the standards of texts, make them more "difficult," standardize their content, make certain that they place more stress on "American" themes of patriotism, free enterprise, and the "western tradition," and link their content to statewide and national tests of educational achievement.

These kinds of pressures are felt not only in the United States. The text has become the center of ideological and educational conflict in a number of other countries as well. In Japan, for instance, the government approval of a right-wing history textbook that retold the story of the brutal Japanese invasion and occupation of China and Korea in a more positive light has stimulated widespread international antagonism and has led to considerable controversy in Japan as well.

Along these same lines, at the very time that the text has become a source of contention for conservative movements, it has stood at the center of controversy for not being progressive enough. Class, gender, and race bias has been

widespread in the materials. All too often, "legitimate" knowledge does not include the historical experiences and cultural expressions of labor, women, people of color, and others who have been less powerful.⁴

All of these controversies are not "simply" about the content of the books students find—or don't find—in their schools, though obviously they are about that as well. The issues also involve profoundly different definitions of the common good (Raskin, 1986), about our society and where it should be heading, about cultural visions, and about our children's future. To quote from Inglis again, the entire curriculum, in which the text plays so large a part, is "both the text and context in which production and values intersect; it is the twistpoint of imagination and power (Inglis, 1985, p. 142). In the context of the politics of the textbook, it is the issue of power that should concern us the most.

The concept of power merely connotes the capacity to act and to do so effectively. However, in the ways we use the idea of power in our daily discourse, "the word comes on strongly and menacingly, and its presence is duly fearful" (Inglis, 1988, p. 4). This "dark side" of power is, of course, complemented by a more positive vision. Here, power is seen as connected to a people acting democratically and collectively, in the open, for the best ideals.⁵ It is this dual concept of power that concerns us here, at the level of both theory (how we think about the relationship between legitimate knowledge and power) and practice (how texts actually embody this relationship). Both the positive and the negative senses of power are essential for us to understand these relationships. Taken together, they signify that arguments about textbooks are really a form of cultural politics. They involve the very nature of the connections between cultural visions and differential power.

This, of course, is not new to anyone who has been interested in the history of the relationship among books, literacy, and popular movements. Books—and one's ability to read them—have themselves been inherently caught up in cultural politics. Take the case of Voltaire, that leader of the Enlightenment who so wanted to become a member of the nobility. For him, the Enlightenment should begin with the "grands." Only when it had captured the hearts and minds of society's commanding heights, only then could it concern itself with the masses below. But for Voltaire and many of his followers, one caution should be taken very seriously. One should take care to prevent the masses from learning to read (Darnton, 1982, p. 13).

For others, teaching "the masses" to read could have a more "beneficial" effect. It enables a "civilizing" process, in which dominated groups would be made more moral, more obedient, more influenced by "real culture" (Batsleer, Davies, O'Rourke, & Weedon, 1985). And for still others, such literacy could bring social transformation in its wake. It could lead to a "critical literacy," one that would be part of larger movements for a more democratic culture, economy, and polity (Lankshear with Lawler, 1987). The dual sense of the power of the text emerges clearly here.

Thus, activities that we now ask students to engage in every day, activities as "simple" and basic as reading and writing, can be at one and the same time forms of regulation and exploitation *and* potential modes of resistance, celebration, and solidarity. Here, I am reminded of Caliban's cry, "You taught me language; and my profit on't is, I know how to curse" (quoted in Batsleer et al., 1985, p. 5).

This contradictory sense of the politics of the book is made clearer if we go into the classrooms of the past. For example, texts have often been related to forms of bureaucratic regulation of both teachers' lives and those of students. Thus, one teacher in Boston in 1899 relates a story of what happened in her first year of teaching during an observation by the school principal. As the teacher rather proudly watched one of her children read aloud an assigned lesson from the text, the principal was less than pleased with the performance of the teacher or her pupil. In the words of the teacher:

The proper way to read in the public school in 1899 was to say, "page 35, chapter 4" and holding the book in the right hand, with the toes pointing at an angle of forty-five degrees, the head held straight and high, the eyes looking directly ahead, the pupil would lift up his voice and struggle in loud, unnatural tones. Now, I had attended to the position of the toes, the right arm, and the nose, but had failed to enforce the mentioning of page and chapter. (Fraser, 1989, p. 128)

Here, the text participates in both bodily and ideological regulation. The textbook in this instance is part of a system of enforcing a sense of duty, morality, and cultural correctness. Yet, historically, the standardized text was struggled for as well as against by many teachers. Faced with large classes, difficult working conditions, insufficient training, and, even more importantly, little time to prepare lessons for the vast array of subjects and students they were responsible for, teachers often looked upon texts not necessarily as impositions but as essential tools. For young women elementary school teachers, the text helped prevent exploitation (Apple, 1988b). It solved a multitude of practical problems. It led not only to deskilling, but to time to become more skilled as a teacher as well.⁶ Thus, there were demands for standardized texts by teachers even in the face of what happened to that teacher in Boston and to so many others.

This struggle over texts was linked to broader concerns about who should control the curriculum in schools. Teachers, especially those most politically active, constantly sought to have a say in what they taught. This was seen as part of a larger fight for democratic rights. Margaret Haley, for instance, one of the leaders of the first teachers' union in the United States, saw a great need for teachers to work against the tendency toward making the teacher "a mere factory hand, whose duty it is to carry out mechanically and unquestioningly the ideas and orders of those clothed with authority of position" (Margaret Haley, quoted in Fraser, 1989, p. 128). Teachers had to fight against the deskilling or, as she called it, "factoryizing" methods of control being sponsored by administrative and industrial leaders. One of the reasons she was so strongly in favor of teachers' councils as mechanisms of control of schools was that this would considerably reduce the immense power over teaching and texts that administrators then possessed. Quoting John Dewey approvingly, Haley wrote:

If there is a single public-school system in the United States where there is official and constitutional provision made for submitting questions of methods, of discipline and teaching, and the questions of curriculum, textbooks, etc. to the discussion of those actually engaged in the work of teaching, that fact has escaped my notice. (Margaret Haley quoted in Fraser, 1989, p. 138)

In this instance, teacher control over the choice of textbooks and how they were to be used was part of a more extensive movement to enhance the democratic rights of teachers on the job. Without such teacher control, teachers would be the equivalent of factory workers whose every move was determined by management.

These points about the contradictory relationships teachers have had with texts and the way such books depower and empower at different moments (and perhaps at the same time) document something of importance. It is too easy to see a cultural practice or a book as totally carrying its politics around with it, "as if written on its brow for ever and a day." Rather, its political functioning "depends on the network of social and ideological relations" it participates in (Bennett, 1986a, p. xvi). Text writing, reading, and use can be retrogressive or progressive (and sometimes some combination of both) depending on the social context. Textbooks can be fought against because they are part of a system of moral regulation. They can be fought for both as providing essential assistance in the labor of teaching and as part of a larger strategy of democratization.

What textbooks do, the social roles they play for different groups, is then very complicated. This has important implications not only for the politics of how and by whom textbooks are used, but for the politics of the internal qualities, the content and organization, of the text. Just as crucially, it also has an immense bearing on how people actually read and interpret the text. It is to these issues that I now want to turn.

The Politics of Cultural Incorporation

We cannot assume that because so much of education has been linked to processes of class, gender, and race stratification,⁷ all of the knowledge chosen to be included in texts simply represents relations of, say, cultural domination or includes only the knowledge of dominant groups. This point requires that I speak theoretically and politically in this section of my argument, for all too many critical analyses of school knowledge—of what is included and excluded in the overt and hidden curricula of the school—take the easy way out. Reductive analysis comes cheap. Reality, however, is complex. Let us look at this in more detail.

It has been argued in considerable detail elsewhere that the selection and organization of knowledge for schools is an ideological process, one that serves the interests of particular classes and social groups (see Apple, 1990, and Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991). However, as I just noted, this does not mean that the entire corpus of school knowledge is "a mirror reflection of ruling class ideas, imposed in an unmediated and coercive manner." Instead, "the processes of cultural incorporation are dynamic, reflecting both continuities and contradictions of that dominant culture and the continual remaking and relegitimation of that culture's plausibility system" (Luke, 1988, p. 24). Curricula aren't imposed in countries like the United States. Rather, they are the products of often intense conflicts, negotiations, and attempts at rebuilding hegemonic control by actually incorporating the knowledge and perspectives of the less powerful under the umbrella of the discourse of dominant groups.

This is clear in the case of the textbook. As disenfranchised groups have fought to have their knowledge take center stage in the debates over cultural legitimacy, one trend has dominated in text production. In essence, little is usually dropped from textbooks. Major ideological frameworks do

not get markedly changed. Textbook publishers are under considerable and constant pressure to include *more* in their books. Progressive *items* are perhaps mentioned, then, but not developed in depth (Tyson-Bernstein, 1988, p. 18). Dominance is partly maintained here through compromise and the process of "mentioning." Here, limited and isolated elements of the culture and history of less powerful groups are included in texts. Thus, for example, a small and often separate section is included on "the contributions of women" and "minority groups," but without any substantive elaboration of the view of the world as seen from their perspective.

Tony Bennett's discussion of the process by which dominant cultures actually become dominant is worth quoting at length here:

Dominant culture gains a purchase not in being imposed, as an alien external force, on to the cultures of subordinate groups, but by reaching into these cultures, reshaping them, hooking them and, with them, the people whose consciousness and experience is defined in their terms, into an association with the values and ideologies of the ruling groups in society. Such processes neither erase the cultures of subordinate groups, nor do they rob "the people" of their "true culture": what they do do is shuffle those cultures on to an ideological and cultural terrain in which they can be disconnected from whatever radical impulses which may (but need not) have fuelled them and be connected to more conservative or, often, downright reactionary cultural and ideological tendencies. (T. Bennett, 1986b, p. 19)

In some cases, "mentioning" may operate in exactly this way, integrating selective elements into the dominant tradition by bringing them into close association with the values of powerful groups. There will be times, however, when such a strategy will not be successful. Oppositional cultures may at times use elements of the dominant culture against such groups. Bennett goes on, describing how oppositional cultures operate, as well:

Similarly, resistance to the dominant culture does not take the form of launching against it a ready-formed, constantly simmering oppositional culture—always there, but in need of being turned up from time to time. Oppositional cultural values are formed and take shape only in the context of their struggle with the dominant culture, a struggle which may borrow some of its resources from that culture and which must concede some ground to it if it is to be able to connect with it—and thereby with those whose consciousness and experience is partly shaped by it—in order, by turning it back upon itself, to peel it away, to create a space within and against it in which contradictory values can echo, reverberate and be heard. (T. Bennett, 1986b, p. 19)

Some texts may, in fact, have such progressive "echoes" within them. There are victories in the politics of official knowledge, not only defeats.

Sometimes, of course, not only are people successful in creating some space where such contradictory values can indeed "echo, reverberate and be heard," but they transform the entire social space. They create entirely new kinds of governments, new possibilities for democratic political, economic, and cultural arrangements. In these situations, the role of education takes on even more importance, since new knowledge, new ethics, and a new reality seek to replace the old. This is one of the reasons that those of us committed to

more participatory and democratic cultures inside and outside of schools must give serious attention to changes in official knowledge in those nations that have sought to overthrow their colonial or elitist heritage. Here, the politics of the text takes on special importance, since the textbook often represents an overt attempt to help create a new cultural reality. The case of the creation of more democratic textbooks and other educational materials based on the expressed needs of less powerful groups in Grenada during the years of the New Jewel Movement provides a cogent example here (see Jules, 1991).

New social contexts, new processes of text creation, a new cultural politics, the transformation of authority relations, and new ways of reading texts, all of these can evolve and help usher in a positive, rather than a negative, sense of the power of the text. Less regulatory and more emancipatory relations of texts to real people can begin to evolve, a possibility made real in many of the programs of critical literacy that have had such a positive impact in nations throughout the world. Here people help create their own "texts," ones that signify their emerging power in the control of their own destinies.

However, we should not be overly romantic here. Such transformations of cultural authority and mechanisms of control and incorporation will not be easy.

For example, certainly the ideas and values of a people are not directly prescribed by the conceptions of the world of dominant groups and just as certainly there will be many instances where people have been successful in creating realistic and workable alternatives to the culture and texts in dominance. Yet we do need to acknowledge that the social distribution of what is considered legitimate knowledge is skewed in many nations. The social institutions directly concerned with the "transmission" of this knowledge, such as schools and the media, are grounded in and structured by the class, gender, and race inequalities that organize the society in which we live. The area of symbolic production is not divorced from the unequal relations of power that structure other spheres (see Hall, 1988, p. 44).

Speaking only of class relations—although much the same could be said about race and gender—Stuart Hall, one of the most insightful analysts of cultural politics, puts it this way:

Ruling or dominant conceptions of the world do not directly prescribe the mental content of the illusions that supposedly fill the heads of dominated classes. But the circle of dominant ideas *does* accumulate the symbolic power to map or classify the world for others; its classifications do acquire not only the constraining power of dominance over other modes of thought but also the initial authority of habit and instinct. It becomes the horizon of the taken-for-granted: what the world is and how it works, for all practical purposes. Ruling ideas may dominate other conceptions of the social world by setting the limit on what will appear as rational, reasonable, credible, indeed sayable or thinkable within the given vocabularies of motive and action available to us. Their dominance lies precisely in the power they have to contain within their limits, to frame within their circumference of thought, the reasoning and calculation of other social groups. (Hall, 1988, p. 44)

In the United States, there has been a movement of exactly this kind. Dominant groups—really a coalition of economic modernizers, what has been called the old humanists, and neoconservative intellectuals—have attempted to create an

ideological consensus around the return to traditional knowledge. The "great books" and "great ideas" of the "western tradition" will preserve democracy. By returning to the common culture that has made this nation great, schools will increase student achievement and discipline, increase our international competitiveness, and ultimately reduce unemployment and poverty.

Mirrored in the problematic educational and cultural visions of volumes such as Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987) and Hirsch's *Cultural Literacy* (1986), this position is probably best represented in quotes from former Secretary of Education William Bennett. In his view, we are finally emerging out of a crisis in which "we neglected and denied much of the best in American education." For a period, "we simply stopped doing the right things [and] allowed an assault on intellectual and moral standards." This assault on the current state of education has led schools to fall away from "the principles of our tradition" (W. Bennett, 1988, p. 9).

Yet, for Bennett, "the people" have now risen up. "The 1980's gave birth to a grass roots movement for educational reform that has generated a renewed commitment to excellence, character, and fundamentals." Because of this, "we have reason for optimism" (W. Bennett, 1988, p. 10). Why? Because:

The national debate on education is now focused on truly important matters: mastering the basics; . . . insisting on high standards and expectations; ensuring discipline in the classroom; conveying a grasp of our moral and political principles; and nurturing the character of our young. (W. Bennett, 1988, p. 10)

Notice the use of "we," "the people," here. Notice as well the assumed consensus on "basics" and "fundamentals" and the romanticization of the past of both schools and the larger society. The use of these terms, the attempt to bring people in under the ideological umbrella of the conservative restoration, is very clever rhetorically. As many people in the United States, Britain, and elsewhere—where rightist governments have been very active in transforming what education is about—have begun to realize, however, this ideological incorporation is having no small measure of success at the level of policy and at the level of whose knowledge and values are to be taught (Apple, 1988a).

If this movement has its way, the texts made available and the knowledge included in them will surely represent a major loss for many of the groups who have had successes in bringing their knowledge and culture more directly into the body of legitimate content in schools. Just as surely, the ideologies that will dominate the official knowledge will represent a considerably more elitist orientation than what we have now.

Yet, perhaps *surely* is not the correct word here. The situation is actually more complex than that, something we have learned from many of the newer methods of interpreting how social messages are actually "found" in texts.

Allan Luke has dealt with such issues very persuasively. It would be best to quote him at length here:

A major pitfall of research in the sociology of curriculum has been its willingness to accept text form as a mere adjunct means for the delivery of ideological content: the former described in terms of dominant metaphors, images, or key ideas; the latter described in terms of the sum total of values,

beliefs, and ideas which might be seen to constitute a false consciousness. For much content analysis presumes that text mirrors or reflects a particular ideological position, which in turn can be connected to specific class interests. . . . It is predicated on the possibility of a one-to-one identification of school knowledge with textually represented ideas of the dominant classes. Even those critics who have recognized that the ideology encoded in curricular texts may reflect the internally contradictory character of a dominant culture have tended to neglect the need for a more complex model of text analysis, one that does not suppose that texts are simply readable, literal representations of "someone else's" version of social reality, objective knowledge and human relations. For texts do not always mean or communicate what they say. (Luke, 1988, pp. 29–30)

These are important points, for they imply that we need more sophisticated and nuanced models of textual analysis. While we should certainly not be at all sanguine about the effects of the conservative restoration on texts and the curriculum, if texts don't simply represent dominant beliefs in some straightforward way and if dominant cultures contain contradictions, fissures, and even elements of the culture of popular groups, then our readings of what knowledge is "in" texts cannot be done by the application of a simple formula.

We can claim, for instance, that the meaning of a text is not necessarily intrinsic to it. As poststructuralist theories would have it, meaning is "the product of a system of differences into which the text is articulated." Thus, there is not "one text," but many. Any text is open to multiple readings. This puts into doubt any claim that one can determine the meanings and politics of a text "by a straightforward encounter with the text itself." It also raises serious questions about whether one can fully understand the text by mechanically applying any interpretive procedure. Meanings, then, can be and are multiple and contradictory, and we must always be willing to "read" our own readings of a text, to interpret our own interpretations of what it means (Grossberg & Nelson, 1988). Answering the question of "whose knowledge" is in a text is not at all simple, it seems, though clearly the right would very much like to reduce the range of meanings one might find.

This is true of our own interpretations of what is in textbooks. But it is also just as true for the students who sit in schools and at home and read (or in many cases don't read) their texts. I want to stress this point, not only at the level of theory and politics as I have been doing here, but at the level of practice.

We cannot assume that what is "in" the text is actually taught. Nor can we assume that what is taught is actually learned. Teachers have a long history of mediating and transforming text material when they employ it in classrooms. Students bring their own classed, raced, and gendered biographies with them as well. They, too, accept, reinterpret, and reject what counts as legitimate knowledge selectively. As critical ethnographies of schools have shown, students (and teachers) are not empty vessels into which knowledge is poured. Rather than what Freire (1973) has called "banking" education going on, students are active constructors of the meanings of the education they encounter.⁸

We can talk about three ways in which people can potentially respond to a text: dominated, negotiated, and opposi-

tional. In the dominated reading of a text, one accepts the messages at face value. In a negotiated response, the reader may dispute a particular claim, but accept the overall tendencies or interpretations of a text. Finally, an oppositional response rejects these dominant tendencies and interpretations. The reader "repositions" herself or himself in relation to the text and takes on the position of the oppressed (Modleski, 1986, p. xi). These are, of course, no more than ideal types and many responses will be a contradictory combination of all three. But the point is that not only do texts themselves have contradictory elements; audiences construct their own responses to texts. They do not passively receive texts, but actually read them based on their own class, race, gender, and religious experiences.

An immense amount of work needs to be done on student acceptance, interpretation, reinterpretation, or partial and/or total rejection of texts. While there is a tradition of such research, much of it quite good, most of this work in education is done in an overly psychologized manner. It is more concerned with questions of learning and achievement than it is with the equally important and prior issues of whose knowledge it is that students are learning, negotiating, or opposing and what the sociocultural roots and effects are of such processes. Yet we simply cannot fully understand the power of the text, what it does ideologically and politically (or educationally, for that matter) unless we take very seriously the way students actually read them—not only as individuals but as members of social groups with their own particular cultures and histories (see Ellsworth, 1988). For every textbook, then, there are multiple texts—contradictions within it, multiple readings of it, and different uses to which it will be put. Texts—be they the standardized, grade-level-specific books so beloved by school systems or the novels, trade books, and alternative materials that teachers use either to supplement these books or simply to replace them—are part of a complex story of cultural politics. They can signify authority (not always legitimate) or freedom.

To recognize this, then, is also to recognize that our task as critically and democratically minded educators is itself a political one. We must acknowledge and understand the tremendous capacity of dominant institutions to regenerate themselves "not only in their material foundations and structures but in the hearts and minds of people." Yet, at the very same time, we need to never lose sight of the power of popular organizations, of real people, to struggle, resist, and transform them (Batsleer et al., 1985, p. 5). Cultural authority, what counts as legitimate knowledge, what norms and values are represented in the officially sponsored curriculum of the school, all of these serve as important arenas in which the positive and negative relations of power surrounding the text will work themselves out. And all of them involve the hopes and dreams of real people in real institutions, in real relations of inequality.

From all that I have said here, it should be clear that I oppose the idea that there can be one textual authority, one definitive set of "facts" that is divorced from its context of power relations. A "common culture" can never be an extension to everyone of what a minority mean and believe. Rather, and crucially, it requires not the stipulation and incorporation within textbooks of lists and concepts that make us all "culturally literate," but the creation of the conditions necessary for all people to participate in the creation and re-creation of meanings and values. It requires a democratic process in

which all people—not simply those who see themselves as the intellectual guardians of the “western tradition”—can be involved in the deliberation of what is important.⁹ It should go without saying that this necessitates the removal of the very real material obstacles—unequal power, wealth, time for reflection—that stand in the way of such participation (Williams, 1989, pp. 37–38.)

The very idea that there is one set of values that must guide the “selective tradition” can be a great danger, especially in contexts of differential power. Take, as one example, a famous line that was printed on an equally famous public building. It read: “There is one road to freedom. Its milestones are obedience, diligence, honesty, order, cleanliness, temperance, truth, sacrifice, and love of country.” Many people may perhaps agree with much of the sentiment represented by these words. It may be of some interest that the building in which they appeared was in the administration block of the concentration camp at Dachau (Horne, 1986, p. 76).

We must ask, then, are we in the business of creating dead texts and dead minds? If we accept the title of educator—with all of the ethical and political commitments this entails—I think we already know what our answer should be.

Notes

¹For a current representative sample of the varied kinds of studies being done on the textbook, see Woodward, Elliot, and Carter Nagel, 1988. We need to make a distinction between the generic use of *texts* (all meaningful materials created by human activity) and textbooks. My focus in this essay will be mostly on the latter, though many schools and many teachers use considerably more than standardized textbook material. For a discussion about and analysis of this wider range of material, see Apple and Christian-Smith, 1991.

²For a history of the social roots of such adoption policies, see Apple, 1989.

³The issue surrounding cultural imperialism and colonialism are nicely laid out in Altbach and Kelly, 1984. For an excellent discussion of international relations over texts and knowledge, see Altbach, 1988.

⁴For some of the most elegant discussions of how we need to think about these “cultural silences,” see Apple and Christian-Smith, 1991, and Roman and Christian-Smith with Ellsworth, 1988.

⁵Inglis, 1988, p. 4. I placed “dark side” in inverted commas in the previous sentence because of the dominant tendency to unfortunately equate darkness with negativity. This is just one of the ways popular culture expresses racism. See Omi and Winant, 1986.

⁶For further discussion of deskilling and reskilling, see Apple, 1985, 1988b.

⁷The literature here is voluminous. For a more extended treatment see Apple, 1985, and McCarthy and Apple, 1989.

⁸See, for example, Willis, 1981; McRobbie, 1978; Everhart, 1983; Weis, 1990; and Trudell, in press. The list could be continued.

⁹This is discussed in more detail in the preface to Apple, 1990.

References

- Altbach, P. (1988). *The knowledge context*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Altbach, P., & Kelly, G. (Eds.). (1984). *Education and the colonial experience*. New York: Transaction Books.
- Apple, M. W. (1985). *Education and power*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1988a). Redefining equality: Authoritarian populism and the conservative restoration. *Teachers College Record*, 90, 167–184.
- Apple, M. W. (1988b). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1989). Regulating the text: The socio-historical roots of state control. *Educational Policy*, 3, 107–123.
- Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (in press). *The politics of official knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & Christian-Smith, L. (Eds.). (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & Weis, L. (Eds.). (1983). *Ideology and practice in schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bastian, A., Fruchter, N., Gittell, M., Greer, C., & Haskins, K. (1986). *Choosing equality: The case for democratic schools*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Batsleer, J., Davis, T., O'Rourke, R., & Weedon, C. (1985). *Rewriting English: Cultural politics of gender and class*. New York: Methuen.
- Bennett, T. (1986a). Introduction: Popular culture and the turn to Gramsci. In T. Bennett, C. Mercer, & J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Popular culture and social relations* (pp. xi–xix). Philadelphia: The Open University Press.
- Bennett, T. (1986b). The politics of the “popular” and popular culture. In T. Bennett, C. Mercer, & J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Popular culture and social relations* (pp. 6–21). Philadelphia: The Open University Press.
- Bennett, W. (1988). *Our children and our country*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Christian-Smith, L. (1991). *Becoming a woman through romance*. New York: Routledge.
- Darnton, R. (1982). *The literary underground of the old regime*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ellsworth, L. (1988). Illicit pleasures: Feminist spectators and *Personal Best*. In L. Roman, L. Christian-Smith, with L. Ellsworth (Eds.), *Becoming feminine: The politics of popular culture* (pp. 102–119). Philadelphia: Falmer.
- Ellsworth, L. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? *Harvard Educational Review*, 59, 297–324.
- Everhart, R. (1983). *Reading, writing and resistance*. Boston: Routledge.
- Fraser, J. W. (1989). Agents of democracy: Urban elementary school teachers and the conditions of teaching. In D. Warren (Ed.), *American teachers: Histories of a profession at work* (pp. 118–156). New York: Macmillan.
- Freire, Paulo. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Grossberg, L., & Nelson, C. (1988). Introduction: The territory of Marxism. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 1–13). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Hall, S. (1988). The toad in the garden: Thatcherism among the theorists. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 35–57). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1986). *Cultural literacy*. New York: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Horne, D. (1986). *The public culture*. Dover, NH: Pluto Press.
- Hunter, A. (1988). *Children in the service of conservatism*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Institute for Legal Studies.
- Inglis, F. (1985). *The management of ignorance: A political theory of curriculum*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Inglis, F. (1988). *Popular culture and political power*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Jules, D. (1991). Building democracy: Content and ideology in Gradian educational texts, 1979–1983. In M. W. Apple & L. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook* (pp. 259–288). New York: Routledge.
- Lankshear, C., with Lawler, M. (1987). *Literacy, schooling and revolution*. Philadelphia: Falmer.
- Luke, A. (1988). *Literacy, textbooks and ideology*. Philadelphia: Falmer.
- McCarthy, C., & Apple, M. W. (1989). Race, class and gender in American educational research. In L. Weis (Ed.), *Class, race and gender in American education* (pp. 9–39). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- McRobbie, A. (1978). Working class girls and the culture of femininity. In Women's Studies Group (Ed.), *Women take issue* (pp. 96–108). London: Hutchinson.
- Modleski, T. (1986). Introduction. In T. Modleski (Ed.), *Studies in entertainment* (pp. ix–xix). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Moffett, J. (1988). *Storm in the mountains*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial formation in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Raskin, M. (1986). *The common good*. New York: Routledge.
- Roman, L., & Christian-Smith, L., with Ellsworth, L. (Eds.). (1988). *Becoming feminine: The politics of popular culture*. Philadelphia: Falmer.
- Rose, S. (1988). *Keeping them out of the hands of Satan*. New York: Routledge.

(continued on page 19)

- and the design of information services. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 4, 223-253.
- Powell, D. R., & Widdows, R. (1987). Social and economic factors associated with parents' decisions about after-school child care: An exploratory study in a medium-sized community. *Child and Youth Care Quarterly*, 16, 268-278.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (1986a). Methodological advances in studying the effects of schools and classrooms on student learning. *Review of Research in Education*, 15, 423-475.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (1986b). A hierarchical model for studying school effects. *Sociology of Education*, 59, 1-7.
- Raywid, M. A. (1985). Family choice arrangements in public schools: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 435-467.
- Rowan, B. (1990). Commitment and control: Alternative strategies for the organizational design of schools. In C. B. Cazden (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education* (Vol. 16, pp. 353-359). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Salganik, L. H., & Carver, R. L. (1992). Strategies for informing families about school choice. Boston: Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning, Report No. 5.
- Scarr, S., Phillips, D., & McCartney, K. (1990). Facts, fantasies and the future of child care in the United States. *Psychological Science*, 1, 26-35.
- Scott, W. R. (1987). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Simon, H. A. (1979). Rational decision making in business organizations. *American Economic Review*, 69, 493-513.
- Smith, M. L. (1991). Put to the test: The effects of external testing on teachers. *Educational Researcher*, 20(5), 8-11.
- Stevenson, H. (1991, April). *Academic achievement and parental beliefs: A longitudinal study in Japan, Taiwan, and the United States*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development. Seattle, WA.
- Thernstrom, A. (1991). *School choice in Massachusetts*. Worcester, MA: Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Turner, P. H., & Gallegos, B. (1984). A comparison of the day care needs, attitudes and practices of intact and single parent families. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 21, 19-30.
- Turner, P. H., & Smith, R. M. (1983). Single parents and day care. *Family Relations*, 32, 215-226.
- Walberg, H. J. (1991). Productive teaching and instruction: Assessing the knowledge base. In H. C. Waxman and H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Effective teaching: Current research* (pp. 33-62). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Weiss, J. A. (1990). Control in school organizations: Theoretical perspectives. In W. H. Clune & J. F. Witte (Eds.), *Choice and control in American education* (Vol. 1: *The theory of choice and control in education*, pp. 91-134). London: Falmer.
- Willer, B. (1989). Licensing and accreditation of child care facilities. In J. S. Lande, S. Scarr, & N. Gunzenhauser (Eds.), *Caring for children: Challenge to America* (pp. 153-166). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Willer, B., Hofferth, S. L., Kisker, E. E., Divine-Hawkins, P., Farquhar, E., & Glantz, F. B. (1991). *The demand and supply of child care in 1990*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Winget, M., Winget, W. G., & Popplewell, J. F. (1982). Including parents in evaluating family day care homes. *Child Welfare*, 61, 195-205.
- Witte, J. F. (1990). Choice and control: An analytical overview. In W. H. Clune & J. F. Witte (Eds.), *Choice and control in American education* (Vol. 1: *The theory of choice and control in education*, pp. 11-46). London: Falmer.

(continued from page 11)

- Rugg, H. *Man and his changing world*. New York: Ginn.
- Schipper, M. (1983). Textbook controversy: Past and present. *New York University Education Quarterly*, 14, 31-36.
- Trudell, B. (in press). *Doing sex education*. New York: Routledge.
- Tyson-Bernstein, H. *A conspiracy of good intentions: America's textbook fiasco*. Washington, DC: The Council on Basic Education.
- Weis, L. (1990). *Working class without work*. New York: Routledge.
- Williams, R. (1961). *The long revolution*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Williams, R. (1989). *Resources of hope*. New York: Verso Books.
- Willis, P. (1981). *Learning to labor*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Woodward, A., Elliot, D., & Carter Nagel, K. (Eds.). (1988). *Textbooks in school and society*. New York: Garland.

THE MIND'S STAIRCASE

Exploring the Conceptual Underpinnings of Children's Thought and Knowledge

Robbie Case
Stanford University

The shortcomings of Piaget's theory of intellectual development are well-known. Less clear is what sort of theory should be devised to replace it. This volume describes the current "main contenders," including neo-Piagetian, neo-connectionist, neo-innatist and sociocultural models. Its contributors conclude that none of these models are adequate because each one implies a view of the human mind which is either too general, too particular, or too modular. A collaborative program of research -- seven years in the making -- is then described, which gives support to a newly emerging synthesis of these various positions.

Contents: Part I: Introduction. R. Case, General and Specific Views of the Mind, its Structure, and Development. R. Case, A Neo-Piagetian Approach to the Issue of Cognitive Generality and Specificity. R. Case, Advantages and Limitations of the Neo-Piagetian Position. **Part II: The Role of Central Conceptual Structures in the Development of Children's Logico-Mathematical Thought.** Z. Marini, Synchrony and Asynchrony in the Development of Children's Scientific Reasoning. S. Griffin, R. Case, R. Sandleson, Synchrony and Asynchrony in the Acquisition of Children's Everyday Mathematical Knowledge. A.M. Capodilupo, A Neo-Structural Analysis of Children's Response to Instruction in the Sight-Reading of Musical Notation. R. Case, R. Sandleson, Testing for the Presence of a Central Quantitative Structure: Use of the Transfer Paradigm. **Part III: The Role of Central Conceptual Structures in the Development of Children's Social and Emotional Thought.** J. Goldberg-Reitman, Young Girls' Conception of Their Mothers' Role: A Neo-Structural Analysis. M. Bruchkowsky, The Development of Empathic Cognition in Middle and Early Childhood. A. McKeough, A Neo-Structural Analysis of Children's Narrative and its Development. S. Griffin, Young Children's Awareness of Their Inner World: A Neo-Structural Analysis of the Development of Intrapersonal Intelligence. A. McKeough, Testing for the Presence of a Central Social Structure: Use of the Transfer Paradigm. **Part IV: The Role of Central Conceptual Structures in the Development of Children's Spatial Thought.** S. Dennis, Stage and Structure in the Development of Children's Spatial Representations. D.T. Reid, Horizontal and Vertical Structure: Stages and Substages in Children's Motor Development. **Part V: Cross-Domain Synchrony and Asynchrony in the Acquisition of Different Central Conceptual Structures.** R. Case, S. Griffin, A. McKeough, Y. Okamoto, Parallels in the Development of Children's Social, Numerical, and Spatial Thought. J. Crammond, Analyzing the Basic Cognitive Developmental Processes of Children With Specific Types of Learning Disability. M. Porath, Stage and Structure in the Development of Children With Various Types of "Giftedness." T.A. Flati, Cross-Cultural Variation in the Structure of Children's Thought. **Part VI: Conclusion.** R. Case, The Mind and its Modules: Toward a Multi-Level View of the Development of Human Intelligence.

0-8058-0324-6 / 1992 / 424pp. / \$79.95
0-8058-1190-7 / \$39.95

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
365 Broadway, Hillsdale, NJ 07642
201/666-4110 FAX 201/666-2394

Call toll-free to order:
1-800-9-BOOKS-9
...9am to 5pm EST only

